

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet contains changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1. In Fig. 1, labels have been added to the boxes.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-12 remain pending, wherein claims 2 and 5 have been amended, and claims 7-12 have been added.

Applicants would like to thank Examiners Khatri and Cherry for their time and courtesy during the personal interview on August 24, 2005. The following highlights some of the topics discussed during the personal interview.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of Applicants' claim for foreign priority and that copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received from the International Bureau.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 2, 3, 4/2, 4/3 and 4/3/2 have been allowed. Accordingly, claim 2 has rewritten as an independent claim incorporating all the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, It is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 4/2 and 7-12 are now allowable.

The Office Action objected to Fig. 1 because boxes shown in the figure were not labeled. Attached is an amended Fig. 1 with labels added to the boxes. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner approve the drawing changes and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

The Office Action objected to claims 5 and 6 because claim 5 is a multiple dependent claim that is dependent on another multiple dependent claim. Claim

5 has been amended to remove the multiple dependency of the claim.

Accordingly, is respectfully requested that objection to claims 5 and 6 be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,703,603 to Tohyama et al. ("Tohyama"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Tohyama does not anticipate Applicants' claim 1 because Tohyama does not disclose all the elements of claim 1. For example, Tohyama does not disclose a "corrected target trajectory generating means for correcting a target trajectory so as to cancel a gain characteristic and a phase characteristic of said feedback control means with respect to a specific frequency," as recited in Applicants' claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Tohyama provides a controller of an optical scanner for positioning a mirror supported by a rotating shaft in order to reduce the errors due to the vibration of the mirror and supporting shaft. (Col. 3, lines 43-53). The vibration errors are reduced by removing from the target trajectory signal a specific frequency component associated with the "flexural vibration of the rotation shaft." (Column 3, lines 54-58). However, Tohyama does not disclose canceling a gain characteristic and a phase characteristic of the feedback control means itself.

The Office Action relies on Col. 12, lines 20-25, and Fig. 6 of Tohyama to disclose that a gain characteristic and a phase characteristic of the feedback control means are cancelled with respect to a specific frequency. However, this section discusses the torsional vibration characteristics of the movable parts and the stability of the servo mechanism. Specifically, referring to fig. 6, Tohyama states that “the first order mode is in phase with a second order mode between the moving coil 13 and the self-contained angle sensor 16, while a third order mode indicates an opposite phase between the moving coil 13 and the self-contained angle sensor 16.” There is no discussion of canceling a gain characteristic and a phase characteristic of the feedback control means itself.

Accordingly, Tohyama does not disclose a “corrected target trajectory generating means for correcting a target trajectory so as to cancel a gain characteristic and a phase characteristic of said feedback control means with respect to a specific frequency,” as recited in Applicants’ claim 1. Because Tohyama does not disclose all the elements of Applicants’ claim 1, Tohyama does not anticipate claim 1. For at least those reasons discussed above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Tohyama be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 1 and 4/1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,850,812 to Dinauer et al. (“Dinauer”) in

view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,146 to Bridgelall et al. ("Bridgelall"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Dinauer and Bridgelall does not render Applicants' claim 1 unpatentable because the combination does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. For example, the combination of Dinauer and Bridgelall does not disclose or suggest "corrected target trajectory generating means for correcting a target trajectory so as to cancel a gain characteristic and a phase characteristic of said feedback control means with respect to a specific frequency," as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

The Office Action states that the function of canceling a gain and phase characteristic of the feedback control means with respect to a specific frequency is intended use and has not been given patentable weight. As discussed during the personal interview, the corrected target trajectory generating means recitation is in a means-plus-function form. Accordingly, the function recited for this means must be given patentable weight in assessing the patentability of this claim, and cannot be ignored as intended use.

The Office Action acknowledges that neither Dinauer or Bridgelall disclose that the corrected trajectory generating means cancels a gain characteristic and a phase characteristic of the feedback control means with respect to a specific frequency. Nevertheless, the Office Action states that "canceling the gain and

phase characteristics can be achieved in feedback.” However, the Office Action has not cited prior art that discloses or suggest such a cancellation.

Because the Office Action acknowledges that Dinauer and Bridgelall each do not disclose or suggest “corrected target trajectory generating means for correcting a target trajectory so as to cancel a gain characteristic and a phase characteristic of said feedback control means with respect to a specific frequency,” the combination cannot disclose or suggest such. Accordingly, the combination of Dinauer and Bridgelall cannot render Applicants’ claim 1 unpatentable.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and is, therefore, patentably distinguishable over the combination of Dinauer and Bridgelall for at least those reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1 and 4 as being unpatentable over Dinauer in view of Bridgelall be withdrawn.

In view of the distinguishing features between the claimed invention and the references, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition of allowance. If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #029116.53150US).

Respectfully submitted,

September 14, 2005



Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169
Stephen W. Palan
Registration No. 43,420

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:AJH:alw

#392975v1